DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 020 FL 019 535

AUTHOR Extra, Guus
TITLE Ethnic Minorities, Language Diversity, and Educational Implications: A Case Study on the Netherlands.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 28p.; In: "Balance & Perspectives: 25 Years of Dutch Applied Linguistics" (see FL 019 532).
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen (Applied Linguistics in Articles); n36 p45-71 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Applied Linguistics; Change Strategies; *Cultural Pluralism; *Demography; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Groups; Foreign Countries; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Minority Groups; *Public Policy; Research Needs; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS Europe (West); *Netherlands

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the Dutch situation looks at how growing immigrant numbers and resulting second language groups have prompted a rethinking of traditional concepts of education. First, ethnic population trends across national boundaries in Western Europe are examined and basic statistics on ethnic minorities in the Netherlands are presented. The consequences of linguistic diversity for elementary, secondary, and adult education are then discussed, focusing on the first and second language acquisition of ethnic minorities at each level. It is concluded that ethnolinguistic variation is conceived by most majority groups in terms of problems and deficits rather than resources and differences. This biased conception is evident in government policy definition of ethnic minority groups, with socioeconomic, not ethnolinguistic, status the primary criterion for access to special services. There is an urgent need for policy on ethnolinguistic variation that would explore and extend existing non-indigenous language resources in the Netherlands. Efforts at each educational level should be extended and coordinated, including development of teacher training programs and teacher qualifications. Research is also needed, and a current effort to promote quality second language instruction in elementary and secondary education must be extended to include first and second language instruction at all levels. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J F MATTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED338020

FL019535

ETHNIC MINORITIES, LANGUAGE DIVERSITY, AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS. A case study on the Netherlands.

Guus Extra
Department of Language and Minorities
P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg
The Netherlands

1. *Introduction*

A common characteristic of ethnic minority groups around the world is that they make use of languages that are different from and dominated by majority group languages. It is also a wide-spread phenomenon that ethnic minority languages are major devices for the expression of ethnicity and self-esteem, whereas proficiency in the surrounding majority language is a prerequisite for educational achievement and access to the labour market. Both facts of life put pressure on a variety of communicative settings within any multi-ethnic society. An obvious meeting-ground for this pressure is education, where both majority and minority languages can be chosen as the subject or instrument of learning. In spite of an increasing impact of immigration and the emergence of ethnic minority groups in Dutch educational institutions over the last two decades, it took a long time before Dutch government came to realize that the existence of ethnic group languages and the existence of Dutch as a second language would ask for a rethinking of traditional and hitherto unquestioned concepts in education.

After a discussion of crossnational trends in Western Europe (section 2) and basic statistics on ethnic minority (henceforward EM) groups in the Netherlands (section 3), attention will be paid to the consequences of language diversity in the domains of elementary, secondary, and adult education (sections 4, 5 and 6). In each of these sections, the focus will be on both first and second language acquisition by EM groups. In a final section (7), some major conclusions about the present state of the art will be presented.

Meanwhile, several extensive bibliographies on EM research in the Netherlands have been published, covering a wide range of topics in different periods of time. Ellemers et al. (1988), Koulen & Smit (1988), and ACOM (1989) focused on the periods of 1945-1986, 1985-1986, and 1984-1989 respectively. The ACOM bibliography for the first time contained a separate section on "language", with a total number of 84 references.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey studies of research on first and second language acquisition or language use of EM groups in the Netherlands have been published by Appel (1986), Extra, van Hout & Vallen (1987), Extra & Vallen (1985, 1988, 1989), and Kroon & Vallen (1989). Most of these studies focused on second rather than first language acquisition.

2. Crossnational trends in Western Europe

It has been estimated that in the year 2000, one-third of the population under the age of 35 in urban Europe will have an immigrant background. As yet, these demographic trends have not led to a proportionally motivated emergence of crossnational studies on the education of EM groups in European countries. Only a small number of rather diverse studies on various countries have been published. An early collection of studies on the language and education of EM groups in the Netherlands, Belgium and Federal Germany was published by Nelde et al. (1981). Tosi (1984) reported on some previous work in EC countries on bilingualism and education in a multi-ethnic society. Churchill (1986) examined a wide range of factors determining the process of policy making during the last two decades for the education of both indigenous and non-indigenous minority groups in OECD countries. Boos-Nünning et al. (1983) offered a comparative perspective on the education of EM children in Belgium, Great-Britain, France and the Netherlands, within the framework of an evaluative study of different experimental programmes. These programmes were carried out under the auspices of the EC Ministers of Education in the cities of Genk, Bedford, Paris and Leiden. In the framework of this crossnational EC project, Tosi (1984) paid special attention to processes of language maintenance and shift over time within the Italian community in Bedford. Fase (1987) did a comparative study on home language instruction programs for EM children in Belgium, France, Great-Britain, Federal Germany, Sweden, and the USA. Finally, Eldering & Kloprogge (1989) collected various reports on the educational or linguistic position of EM children in similar countries (minus the USA, plus the Netherlands). From these reports, the following crossnational trends emerge (see also Extra & Vallen 1989).

1. In all countries similar demographic trends can be observed over time. First, an economically motivated process of migration, especially originating from Mediterranean countries, took place. This migration related to contract workers who were expected to stay for a limited period of time. As the period of their stay gradually became longer, the pattern of economic migration was followed by a pattern of social migration of remaining families. Finally, a second generation was born in the immigrant countries and grew up with uncertainty and ambivalence about whether to 'stay or go'. These demographic shifts over time are also reflected in shifts of denotation for the groups under consideration (foreign workers, migrant workers, immigrant families, and ethnic minorities, respectively), and in repeated demographic

announcements by governmental authorities that their country "should not be seen as an immigrant country".

2. In all countries under consideration, most EM groups have a disadvantaged status from various perspectives. First of all, they have a low socio-economic status, determined by a low level of education and profession or employment. Moreover, their legal status is poor; the inequality of legal rights between majority and minority groups is marked for EM groups originating from non-EC countries. Finally, the languages and cultures of the source countries of EM groups commonly have a low status in the perception of the indigenous majority; this is especially true for EM groups originating from Islamic countries. Because of the demographic shifts mentioned under (1), there is a growing percentage of EM groups in educational institutions. When taking a closer look, however, one finds an overrepresentation of EM groups in lower types of education and an underrepresentation in higher ones.

3. EC guidelines on the education of EM groups were published in 1977 and came into force in 1981. Boos-Nünning et al. (1983) and Tosi (1984) discussed these guidelines from a historical perspective. The guidelines called for special attention and facilities for both L1 and L2 instruction. However, these guidelines did not result in a consensus about the weight of the two languages in the actual school curriculum. In fact, there is a top-down focus of dominant groups (e.g., national or local authorities, school principals, and majority language teachers) on L2 acquisition, most commonly in combination with a rather negative attitude towards L1 maintenance over time. On the other hand, there is a bottom-up focus of dominated groups (e.g., ethnic community organizations, parents, minority language teachers) on L1 acquisition and L1 maintenance over time. Corresponding with the demographic shift mentioned under (1), a shift over time can also be observed in the arguments of L1 instruction for EM children. Initially, its importance derived from the prospect of return-migration to the country of origin. More recently, its importance for the development and maintenance of ethnic identity, for the purposes of intergenerational communication, and for L2 acquisition is being stressed.

4. L1 and L2 are most commonly taught by different teachers. In fact, bilingualism is seen as a desirable objective for EM groups rather than as a necessary precondition for their teachers. A common characteristic of L2 teachers is that they have little, if any, command of the L1 of EM groups. Typically, L1 teachers have a low L2 proficiency (although L1 teachers are usually more proficient in the two languages under consideration than L2 teachers), and a low team status within schools in terms of type of contract, number of lessons to be given, and participation in team decisions. Table 1 gives a survey of qualifications

that are commonly attributed to the distribution of majority and minority teachers, pupils and languages in elementary schools.

Table 1. Distribution of majority and minority teachers, pupils, and languages in elementary schools

Teacher	Pupil	Language	Attribution
Maj	Maj	Maj	regular instruction
Maj	Min	Maj	second language instruction
Maj	Min	Min	beyond conception
Maj	Maj	Min	beyond conception
Min	Min	Min	home language instruction
Min	Maj	Min	beyond conception
Min	Maj	Maj	gaining support
Min	Min	Maj	gaining support

5. Finally, there is a broad spectrum of variation in the proficiency of EM groups in majority and minority languages. The common inter-generational pattern of language shift over time, observed in predominantly English speaking immigrant countries like the USA, Canada or Australia is as follows:

Interaction	Preferred language
parent to parent	minority language
parent to child	minority language
child to parent	minority plus majority language
child to child	majority language

As yet, it is unclear to what degree such patterns of language shift over time will apply to which EM groups in Western Europe. However, although the concepts of first language (L1) and second language (L2) will be used to refer to the dominated minority language and the dominant majority language respectively, it must be borne in mind that such equations will become less obvious over time.

3. *Ethnic minorities in the Netherlands*

It is often erroneously suggested that immigration and multilingualism are recent phenomena in Dutch society. As in other industrialized European countries, the number of immigrants in the Netherlands at any time seems to correspond with its relative economic and cultural prosperity. From historical research (cf. Lucassen & Penninx 1985) it can be gathered that in the 17th Century, a period of great economic and cultural prosperity in the Netherlands, about 10% of the population came

from abroad. This figure decreased during the 18th and 19th centuries to less than 2%. With the economic revival of the 1960s and 1970s, the figure grew again to 7% in 1988, especially because of the immigration from Mediterranean countries and former Dutch colonies. Table 2 gives a survey of the main non-indigenous groups in the Netherlands (n > 1500) in January 1989; at that time, the indigenous Dutch population amounted to 14.181.600 inhabitants.

Table 2. Main non-indigenous minority groups in the Netherlands, January 1989

1.	**Ex-colonial territories**		**4. Refugees**		
	Surinam	210.000	Vietnam	6.400
	Dutch Antilles	66.000	Pakistan	4.300
	Moluccas	40.000	Ghana	4.200
			Hungary	4.000
2.	**Mediterranean countries**		Turkish Christians	3.700
	Turkey	177.300	Poland	3.100
	Morocco	139.700	Ethiopia	2.700
	Spain	17.400	Sri Lanka (Tamils)	2.600
	Italy	16.100	Czechoslowakia	2.000
	Yugoslavia	12.200	Chile	1.800
	Portugal	8.100		
	Greece	4.300	**5. Countries with similar SES**	
	Tunisia	2.600	West-Germany	40.700
	Capverdian Isl.	2.300	Great-Britain	37.400
			Belgium	23.300
3.	**Chinese**	31.000	USA	10.700
			France	8.100
			Ireland	3.400
			Austria	3.000
			Canada	2.600
			Switzerland	1.900

The actual or estimated figures derive from the Central Bureau of Statistics and from Muus (1989). Within the total non-indigenous population of the Netherlands, the following main groups can be distinguished:

1. Immigrants from former Dutch colonies. Surinamese may be speakers of Sranan-Tongo, Sarnami, Hindustani, Javanese, Hakka, or Surinamese Dutch, whereas Antillians may be speakers of Papiamentu or Dutch. Both in Surinam and on the Antillian Islands, Dutch has so far preserved the status of official language. Within the group that hails from the former Dutch East Indies, the Moluccans take a special position from a cultural, linguistic and religious perpective, and because many of them "repatriated" involuntarily to the Netherlands in 1951 and have since then been stateless. Moluccans may speak Moluccan-Malay, High-Malay, Melaju-Sini or Dutch.

2. Labour migrants and their families from Mediterranean countries. Most of them originate from Turkey and Morocco, two Mediterranean countries that do not belong to the member-states of the European Community. Turks may speak Turkish, Kurdish or Turoyo-Aramese, whereas Moroccans may be speakers of Moroccan-Arabic or mutually different Berber varieties like Tarifit, Tamazigt or Taselhit.
3. Chinese immigrants from countries like China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore and Hongkong. Chinese may speak Mandarin-Chinese, Cantonese, Whenzhou or Shanghai-dialect.
4. Political refugees from Eastern-Europe, Asia, Africa and South-America.
5. Immigrants from countries with a socio-economic status comparable to the Netherlands.

In contrast to immigrant countries like the USA, Canada or Australia, no periodical census on home language use of EM are collected in the Netherlands. As a consequence, little reliable information is available on the actual distribution of home language varieties used by the different groups under discussion.

Table 3. Non-Dutch students in various types of education, during 1985/1986 school year

	N1	N2	%
Elementary education (BO)	1.468.720	82.775	5.64
Special education (SO)	99.545	5.042	5.06
General secondary education (AVO)	804.826	20.434	2.54
Lower vocational training (LBO)	359.252	19.139	5.33
Secondary vocational training (MBO)	276.241	3.181	1.15
Higher vocational training (HBO)	148.863	3.232	1.49
University education (WO)	168.858	3.482	2.06

N1: total number of students
N2: total number of non-Dutch students
% : percentage of non-Dutch students

Prognoses of the Dutch Interuniversity Demographic Institute (cf. Schoorl 1988) refer to a significant increase of the number of Turkish and Moroccan inhabitants in 1992, as a result of extended family reunion, marriages, and birth rates. For Turkish inhabitants, the estimated figures fluctuate between 190.000 and 197.000, for Moroccans between 157.000 and 163.000. For other groups, reliable estimates are difficult to give. Entzinger (1987) estimated the number of new immigrants to be at least 25.000 per year until the end of the 20th century. The four largest EM groups (Surinamese, Antillians, Turks, and Moroccans) are concentrated in the four largest cities of the Netherlands (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht). The influx of EM children in elementary schools in these cities is presently about 40%, and will increase to more than 50% in

the year 2000. However, there is a large variation in percentages between different schools. In the country as a whole, the number of elementary schools with more than 50% of EM children increased by 70% between 1980 and 1984. Table 3 gives a survey of non-Dutch students in various types of education during the 1985/1986 school year (cf. Roelandt & Veenman 1988).

In the year 1985/1986, more than 137.000 non-Dutch students participated in these Dutch educational institutions. EM students are especially underrepresented in general secondary education and overrepresented in lower vocational training. Whereas about 70% of all native-Dutch students participate in the former type of education and 30% in the latter, these percentages are approximately reverse for Turkish and Moroccan students.

4. *Ethnic minority children in elementary education*

The first governmental report in which the education of EM children was taken into account, was published by the Ministry of Social Affairs (Roolvink 1970). In this report, two alternative approaches were indicated, i.e. "regular" vs. "national" education. The first concept related in fact to submersion in classrooms with native Dutch children; the second one related to home language instruction, and it was conceived as a preparation for later return migration. The Ministry of Education took a different perspective and was more concerned with the consequences of a permanent stay in the Netherlands. Over the years, however, the focus of the Ministry of Education was on social disadvantages of EM children rather than cultural or linguistic differences (e.g. Van Kemenade 1974, Minister of Education at that time). The main reason why the Chinese community in the Netherlands has not been included in the target groups of governmental EM policy until now derives from the fact that it has not been shown that the Chinese have a disadvantaged socio-economic status comparable to that of other EM groups. The biased focus on social disadvantage led to repeated announcements about "language deficits" as a standardlike qualification for a relatively low proficiency in Dutch as a second language, and to a systematic underestimation of the value and possible role of ethnic community languages in education. EM children were actually conceived as "handicapped" bilinguals who should give up their home language in order to make a successful educational career in monolingual Dutch schools. Minister Pais, van Kemenade's successor at the Ministry of Education, also stressed the "multiple disadvantage" of EM children, a concept that included "language deficits". In the policy plan of Pais (1981) however, a conceptual shift was expressed in the announcement of the following major goals for education:

- education should contribute to eliminating the disadvantaged position of EM groups by means of special facilities for L2 instruction;

- education should take into account the identity of EM groups by means of special facilities for home language instruction;
- education should contribute to the development of a multi-ethnic society by means of intercultural concepts.

Concrete guidelines for classroom activities, however, remained vague, both in terms of first and second language instruction. This vagueness was a direct effect of a general and historical reluctance to define the content or didactics of any type of education in Dutch governmental policy. Moreover, the concept of "intercultural education" was actually conceived by many Dutch teachers as a non-compelling alternative to home language instruction. As yet, the concept of bilingual education did not appear on the government's agenda, and international trends on first and second language instruction for EM children (e.g., in the US, Canada, or Sweden) had a surprisingly low impact. Although many EM children had already passed through Dutch elementary classrooms in the early eighties, an expert report of the ACLO *Moedertaal* (1982) had to mention that instruction in Dutch as a second language should be conceived as a specialism that differs largely from instruction in Dutch as a first language, and would therefore need drastic modifications in teacher training programs. The ACLO report went its way unnoticed by the government. Moreover, the need for choosing between different educational models for home language instruction, oriented towards language transition or language maintenance, was not recognized (cf. Extra & Vallen 1989).

As a consequence of demographic shifts over time, another trend in elementary education for EM children has been the shift in attention from higher grade entrants (i.e., children who immigrated into the Netherlands) to first grade entrants (i.e., children born in the Netherlands and having their successive educational experiences together with native Dutch peers from the beginning). During the seventies, higher grade entrants were assigned to separate classes that were heterogeneous in terms of both ethnic background and age range. Apart from separate instruction in L2 Dutch, EM children received additional instruction in particular subjects (e.g., handicraft or gymnastics) together with native Dutch children. If the number of EM children at a particular school was low, these children were most commonly submerged in "regular" classes, with some extra-curricular attention of special L2 teachers during a few hours per week. Hardly any specific course material for L2 instruction existed, nor were there specific diagnostic instruments for measuring L2 proficiency at various stages of the school curriculum. Moreover, teachers were not prepared or trained for this type of instruction. Experiences were locally gained in practice, without professional support or country-wide documentation. As a result, there was little exchange and accumulation of knowledge. Given the distant role of the government in matters of content or didactics, educational policy was basically oriented towards the assignment of extra teaching hours. These facilities were related to

duration of stay in the Netherlands rather than to duration or type of L2 learning problems.

During the eighties, the focus of educational concern shifted towards EM children who entered Dutch elementary schools from the age of 4 - 5 years together with native Dutch peers. Meanwhile, a rather wide variety of course material for L2 instruction came into existence (cf. Bienfait & Salverda 1987 for an overview), including a diagnostic test for measuring oral skills of 5 to 9 year-old children (cf. Verhoeven et al. 1986). Because surveys of L2 materials were descriptive instead of evaluative, new problems arose. Teachers find it difficult to select the right material in their specific conditions. Moreover, little material is available for the training of particular skills at particular ages, e.g. techniques for expanding the receptive and productive vocabulary of younger children or promoting the literacy (both reading and writing) of older children.

In the new Elementary Education Act that became operative in 1985, a complex system of determining the total number of teachers was introduced at each elementary school. The precise number of eligible teachers is yearly recalculated per school, depending upon socio-economic variables of the children's parents. Cumulative staff facilities are assigned to a particular school in cases of immigrant background of (one of) the parents, low level of parental profession or schooling, and one-parent families. However, many school principals and teachers do not recognize the linkage between these factors and the total number of staff for their school. Consequently, the extra facilities originally meant for the specific support of EM children are often used for rather different and heterogeneous purposes (cf. Tesser et al. 1989). The Dutch Advisory Council on Elementary Education (ARBO), being in favour of submersion of EM children in regular classes, made an urgent plea for a goal-oriented earmarking and distribution of these facilities (cf. ARBO 1988). However, the Minister of Education has not honoured this advice up till now. Although many EM children throughout the elementary school curriculum are in need of special assistance given their lower proficiency in Dutch compared to native Dutch children, they are often submerged in regular classes without adequate support. Depending on the ethno-linguistic variation within a particular classroom, such support may be given within or outside regular lessons. The need for special instruction is in particular observed in parts of the mainstream curriculum where Dutch is the culture-dependent medium of instruction. A major point of concern is the transfer of L2 skills acquired in lessons on Dutch to other subjects where proficiency in Dutch is instrumental for learning, e.g. in geography lessons.

Apart from EM children who enter Dutch schools together with native Dutch peers, higher grade entrants are in need of special attention. According to the earlier mentioned ARBO (1988), these children should be intensively prepared for mainstream education by specially trained and motivated teachers, instead of being immediately submerged in regular classes. The teachers' efforts should maximally build on and profit from previous learning experiences of the children in their

respective home countries. From a socio-cultural point of view, the children should learn to cope with an abrupt transition to a new environment; from a linguistic point of view, they should receive systematic and effective L2 instruction in intensive programs. In conformity with recommendations of the ARBO (1988), special facilities have been granted for such instruction to single or clustered schools during a maximum of one year, as a preparation for mainstream education. In a number of cities throughout the country experimental programs have been set up to gain experiences with these preparatory classes.

Another major point of concern remains home language instruction (henceforward HLI) for EM children. In spite of many arguments in favour of HLI (cf. Extra 1989), the Ministry of Education did not assume any responsibility in this domain during the seventies. There were some private initiatives of parents, embassies or migrant workers' foundations, and HLI usually took place outside the school at extra-curricular hours. In the mid-1970's the national government began to take more responsibility for HLI. It acquired a modest place within the school curriculum and during school hours, and it increasingly took place under the jurisdiction of local school authorities.

Towards the end of the 1970's, government came to acknowledge the fact that the majority of children would stay in the Netherlands. This acknowledgement led to policy modifications with regard to HLI (cf. Pais, 1981). Ultimately, the position of HLI was settled as follows in Article 11 of the earlier mentioned Elementary Education Act (1985, translated quotations):

1. For the benefit of pupils from a non-Dutch cultural background, school authorities can introduce HLI into the school curriculum. By general rule, the National Council on Education having been consulted, it is decided to which pupils the aforementioned instruction will be given.
2. Pupils who are not registered at a particular school can also be admitted to HLI in those cases in which their own school does not provide this instruction.
3. Pupils are only obliged to receive this instruction at the request of their parents.
4. Of the hours spent on HLI, two and a half hours at the most are to be counted among the total number of hours of instruction which pupils are supposed to receive every week.
5. The maximum time of HLI is set at six hours a day.

The Elementary Education Act reveals remarkable differences in legal treatment of indigenous as opposed to non-indigenous minority languages (cf. Extra 1989). A salient example is Frisian, spoken in the province of Friesland. While Frisian is a compulsory subject for all children in Frisian schools and exemptions must be requested and motivated by the parents concerned, HLI for EM children "can" be given, if local school authorities deem it to be useful, if pupils concerned fall within the scope of specific groups to be determined by the Minister of

Education, and if the pupils' parents insist on such instruction. Moreover, Article 11 indicates that HLI for EM children is not necessarily provided under the same roof as the rest of the curriculum. According to present regulations, HLI can be offered to the following target groups:

1. children who have at least one parent of Moluccan origin;
2. children of foreign workers from Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, Cap Verdians, Morocco, Portugal, Spain, Tunisia, or Turkey;
3. children of parents from member states of the European Community not mentioned under 2, in accordance with EC guidelines;
4. children of legally admitted political refugees.

Access to HLI is not granted to three other relatively large ethnic groups in the Netherlands: Chinese, Antillian, and Surinamese children. As mentioned before, the Chinese are not conceived as a target group of governmental policy on EM groups (note 1). Antillian and Surinamese children are excluded, because Dutch is the official language of these ex-colonial source countries. Due to historically derived and repeatedly expressed strong anti-Indonesian resentments of the Moluccan community in the Netherlands, however, Moluccan children have access to HLI in Moluccan-Malay instead of Bahasa, the official language of Indonesia. Finally, and again apart from Moluccan children, access to HLI is limited to EM children whose parents (or at least one of them) immigrated into the Netherlands.

The main arguments of opponents of HLI are that it is segregational and will lead to an accumulation of deficits, because EM children will miss "regular" lessons. Against this background, a repeatedly asked question in governmental policy has been: what are the effects of HLI on educational achievement (cf. e.g., WRR 1989a). In this biased conception, progress in home language proficiency as a result of HLI is not taken into account as "educational achievement". If it were, the policy question would become totally vacuous. Moreover, various reports have shown that participation in HLI does not lead to lower results in other subjects (including Dutch), and may even have positive effects on these subjects (cf. Appel 1984, Roelandt & Veenman 1988, Driessen et al. 1989). Finally, all available findings point to a strong ethnic community support of concerned parents, children, and teachers for HLI (cf. Van de Wetering 1986).

A widely collected survey of the Inspection of Education at all elementary schools that offer HLI in the Netherlands ($n = 1.251$, response 96%) showed that many Dutch school principals and teachers were insufficiently informed about HLI (cf. Inspectierapport 27, 1988). Descriptions of goals and contents of HLI were often lacking, and many planned lessons were not given. Moreover, there was no significant connection between HLI and the rest of the school curriculum, nor between home language teachers and their colleague-Dutch teachers. Finally, the available course material for HLI was insufficient and rather inadequate (see also Driessen et al. 1987).

In a climate of public debates about the right of existence of HLI, the Institute for Curriculum Development published a report (cf. Project-

groep Legio 1987) to reduce the continuing uncertainty about the target groups of HLI, and about its goals, contents, effects, and relationship with the rest of the school curriculum. The Legio report was meant as a content-oriented proposal that would elicit feedback from a variety of concerned groups (cf. Meestringa 1989 for a collection of comments). A remarkable governmental confirmation of the importance of HLI was recently announced in a testamentary report of Ginjaar-Maas (1989), the late Deputy Minister of Education. In this report, the following guidelines were confirmed:

1. EM children who wish to take part in HLI, should have the right to do so.
2. HLI is a school task, and it should therefore be a regular part of the school curriculum (note 2).
3. HLI should aim at language acquisition and language maintenance over time, in order to get and keep access to ethnic community cultures, and it should contribute to the development of a cultural identity in Dutch society.

Moreover, Ginjaar-Maas stressed the importance of bilingual education for EM children throughout the elementary school curriculum. Although HLI should especially be promoted in the lower grades, including the possibility of using the home language as a medium of instruction in other subjects, HLI should remain a regular part of the curriculum in higher grades for 2,5 hours per week. Moreover, HLI should focus on the standard language of the source country of EM children; if there were a substantial gap between home language and standard language, the former would be permitted as a medium of instruction in the lower grades. Due to financial restrictions, no extension of the target groups of HLI was proposed, e.g. in terms of language background or generation. Access of third generation children to HLI, however, was taken into consideration.

One can speculate about the reasons for the remarkably affirmative testament of Ginjaar-Maas (1989a), after a decade of strong restraint. One reason is overtly expressed in the report itself. Recently, the Scientific Council for Governmental Policy in the Netherlands, published a report on EM Policy (WRR 1989a) in which HLI was further marginalized. The Council made a plea for transferring HLI outside the "regular" school curriculum, for considering such instruction as a "voluntary by-product" for those children who want to take part, and for restricting such participation to already denominated target groups "because of the growing heterogeneity of home language backgrounds" of EM children. Obviously, the Ministry of Education wanted, at this particular point, to anticipate a favourable governmental reaction to the Council's advice, and, as it looks now, not without success.

Another, more covert reasoning of the Ministry of Education in favour of HLI might be to counterbalance the growing tendency within at least some EM groups to found their own schools. Dutch education is

primarily based on constitutional freedom of denomination. In practice, this implies the right of any individual or group of individuals to found a school, appoint a school board and teachers, and organize instruction according to a particular denomination, if at least 50 potential pupils for such a school can be recruited and maintained. Any school can expect full financial support from the government, if it operates within the legal margins of number and type of subjects to be taught, teacher qualifications, and examination standards. In this way and over many decades, Catholic, Protestant and non-denominational schools were founded and given financial support. Most recently, the first Islamic and Hindu schools have been added to this spectrum on the basis of the same constitutional right. However, the pressure on this development was bottom-up rather than top-down, and initiatives in this domain have been treated reluctantly by both local and national authorities.

5. Ethnic minority students in secondary education

As a main trend in elementary education for EM children, the shift of attention from higher to first grade entrants was mentioned in section 2. A similar trend emerged more recently in secondary education. During the seventies, immigrated youngsters were most commonly referred to so-called "international classes", which were intended as a one- or two-year transition period before students would enter mainstream secondary education. Within these classes the focus was on intensive L2 instruction (cf. Fase & De Jong 1983). Due to the heterogeneity of target groups and the absence of precise goals, qualified course material, and specially trained teachers, these classes became a final station instead of a bridge to further education for many EM students. A large variety in the number and type of extra-curricular L2 lessons was also evidenced in a confidential report of the Inspection of Secondary Education, offered to the Minister of Education in 1983 (cf. Inspectiewerkgroep 1983). In this report, based on the outcomes of questionnaires, the Inspection made an urgent plea for the improvement of L2 instruction and for a better preparation of teachers for this type of instruction.

In 1987, the Ministry of Education changed the facilities for EM students in secondary schools. In fact, this change led to a reduction of facilities for extra L2 tuition. Moreover, the facilities were to be limited to the period of residence in the Netherlands (rather than to observed learning problems), and they were to be granted only if both parents of a particular student had immigrated from an exhaustively specified group of Mediterranean or ex-colonial territories. In practice, the existing facilities are insufficient for all EM students who are in need of special L2 tuition. Moreover, little information is available on how these facilities are actually used or mis-used in secondary schools (cf. Van Gurp 1989 for a multiple case study). Corresponding with governmental policy on higher grade entrants in elementary schools, new facilities have been granted in the meanwhile to selected secondary schools for the develop-

ment of experimental intensive program for recently arrived, limited- or non-Dutch speaking students, as a preparation for mainstream education. In these programs, experiences are being gained with special instruction in subjects like L2 proficiency (including initial literacy), L1 proficiency, and arithmetics.

The earlier mentioned Scientific Council for Governmental Policy recently published a series of documents on desirable terminal goals for a whole range of subjects for 12-16 year old students in secondary education. In the Council's document on Dutch language (cf. WRR 1989b), similar terminal goals for both native and non-native Dutch speaking students have been formulated. However, native-Dutch speaking students were the Council's common point of reference, and special needs or ambitions of EM students have only rarely been taken into account.

There is a growing number of EM children who start their educational career in secondary schools on the basis of past experiences at Dutch elementary schools. Given the hierarchically differentiated structure of secondary education in the Netherlands, the advice of elementary school directors for the most suitable type of secondary schooling for EM children is a good indicator of these children's educational achievement at the end of elementary schools. There is evidence that the social composition of elementary schools has an influence on these recommendations; if schools have many EM children, these children tend to receive "higher" recommendations for the type of secondary schooling (cf. Tesser et al. 1989). The most common explanation for this phenomenon is that elementary schools with a large population of EM children will spend more time and will focus more specifically on their learning needs. However, the actual elementary school performance of EM children in specific subjects like Dutch language, arithmetics, and world orientation should be taken into account in the first place (cf. Kerkhoff 1988). To study the relationship between the results in these subjects and the type of advice for secondary schooling is one of the main goals in an ongoing nationwide evaluation of elementary school performance (cf. Kloprogge 1989).

A major educational change for pupils who enter secondary schools is the increase of different teachers and different subjects. This change is even greater for EM children who have a lower proficiency in Dutch than their native-Dutch peers. Most commonly, they are in need of more academically oriented skills and knowledge for taking part in lessons where Dutch is the subject or medium of instruction. Special L2 instruction may be organized at separate extra-curricular hours or in integrated lessons with both native and non-native Dutch speaking students. In the latter case, there will be large variation in the number and L2 proficiency level of EM students. As yet, there is hardly any evidence on the contents or effects of these two types of instruction.

Although there is a variety of course material for L2 instruction in secondary schools, most material is not oriented towards the more advanced L2 learning problems of EM students who previously took part

in Dutch elementary schools (cf. Bienfait & Salverda 1986 for a survey of available course material). The same characteristics hold for the most widely used diagnostic instrument for testing L2 proficiency (cf. Van der Linden et al. 1983). A major obstacle for most EM students is the reading comprehension of Dutch text books throughout the secondary school curriculum (cf. Hacquebord 1989, Hofmans-Okkes 1987). Haquebord (1989) showed that Turkish students had significantly lower scores on Dutch vocabulary comprehension tasks than their native-Dutch peers. Steinert et al. (1985) developed a series of booklets for dealing with Dutch jargon in a variety of professional subjects. The main issue is that progress in subjects like mathematics, geography, history, or economics is not only dependent on the availability of a rather abstract and sophisticated vocabulary, but also on more hidden general background knowledge. It is precisely the latter domain where EM students do not necessarily share the standards of their native Dutch peers. Because of these differences in general background knowledge, EM students tend to get fewer turns and less attention from their Dutch teachers in daily practice. Apart from a lack of specialized course material for L2 instruction, as yet no specialized training has been foreseen for teachers of Dutch or teachers of other subjects who have to cope with non-native Dutch students in their classrooms.

Governmental concern for HLI of EM students in secondary education was only expressed for the first time in 1985, when an extension of the Secondary Education Law was proposed and adopted. Since then, HLI for EM students has been allowed with similar restrictions as can be observed in the Elementary Education Law discussed in section 4. HLI "can" be offered, if local school authorities deem it to be useful, and if the students concerned fall within the scope of specific target groups to be determined by governmental decisions. Apart from Moluccan-Malay and Turoyo-Aramese (for children of Christian refugees from Turkey), instruction should be given in the standard language of the countries of origin. The need for standard language instruction was also evidenced in a report of De Jong et al. (1988), who studied the attitudes of EM parents at this particular point. Parental attitudes were shown to derive largely from the status of standard language use and from its function of access to literacy. Moreover, De Jong et al. found that especially Turkish and Moroccan secondary school students were eager to improve their proficiency in Turkish or Arabic. Highly positive attitudes towards secondary education in these two languages were also reported by Bergman (1989).

In 1987, the Inspection of Special Services published the outcomes of a survey on HLI in secondary schools, based on written questionnaires, oral interviews, and classroom observations (cf. Inspectierapport 15, 1987). HLI was offered at 31 schools in 1986/1987 (a figure that rose to 81 in 1988/1989). The most frequently offered languages in 1986/1987 were Turkish (25x) and Arabic (23x), whereas Spanish and Portuguese were offered only twice and once respectively. Most teachers were not (yet) qualified for HLI, and apart from HLI they mostly had a variety of tasks at different schools. The degree of participation in HLI was quite high for

Turkish and Arabic (66% and 74% respectively, in first year groups of secondary schools), and most students were highly motivated to take part in these lessons. The proficiency level of EM students in the target languages of instruction showed large variation. At the same time, the teachers worked with a variety of imported or self-made course material. Only half of the schools had formulated specific goals for HLI. On the basis of these findings, the Inspection team made a plea for extending HLI to more EM groups, for integrating HLI in the rest of the school curriculum, and for the development of terminal goals, course material, and language proficiency tests.

With respect to curriculum and course ware development for HLI, first initiatives have again been taken for Turkish and Arabic. With the financial support of the government, the so-called "ARTUVO project" was launched as a cooperative initiative of the National Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO) and the city of Amsterdam. For these two languages, also special three-year teacher training programs were initiated in 1984 in Amsterdam (Arabic) and Rotterdam (Turkish). Since the start of these programs, the interest in admission amongst EM students has been much larger than the limited capacity of the programs would allow for. Meanwhile, both the quality of the first ARTUVO course material and the quality of the teacher training programs have received a critical response (cf. Schoolblad, April 1989; Buitenlanders Bulletin, June 1987).

Given the underrepresentation of EM students in higher types of secondary education, HLI is as yet primarily offered in the lower types. In all cases, ethnic group languages can be chosen as subjects instead or on top of other subjects, including French or German. A remarkable difference between legislation on traditionally taught foreign languages like English, French, and German, and recent ethnic group languages in the Netherlands is that the latter can not be taken as a subject by native-Dutch speaking students. The restriction of ethnic group language instruction to "home" language instruction does not only lead to unequal treatment of students and languages, but it also implies arbitrary decisions on questions like who speaks this "home language" to whom in what circumstances (cf. Extra 1986). Does the concept of "home language", for instance, relate to the primary language of both parents, in interaction with each other, and/or with their children?

As yet, research on non-indigenous language needs at secondary schools in the Netherlands has focused on the needs of native speakers of Dutch (e.g., former students) in the traditional domains of English, German, and French (cf. Buis & Oud-de Glas 1982). There is an urgent need of more sophisticated statistics on yearly interest in non-indigenous language instruction amongst all students in secondary schools. On the basis of such data, policy plans should be developed with respect to the type and number of non-indigenous languages that should be offered in schools, and for which curriculum development, teacher training, and teacher recruitment should be promoted. Moreover, a comprehensive national policy should be devised for education in other languages than

traditionally have been taught in Dutch secondary schools. In table 4, a survey of non-indigenous languages is presented that at least should be taken into account in such a policy.

Table 4. Survey of non-indigenous languages to be taken into account in secondary educational policy

	1	2	3	4	5
English	+		+		
German		+	+		
French		+	+		
Italian			+	+	
Spanish			+	+	
Portuguese			+	+	
Greek			+	+	
Danish			+		
Irish			+		
Turkish				+	
Arabic				+	
Moluccan-Malay				+	
Serbo-Croatian				+	
e.g. Chinese					+
Papiamento					+

Present status of 1-5:

1: compulsory in upper elementary education and in most types of secondary education
2: German or French compulsory in most types of secondary education as "second foreign" language
3: official languages of European Community member-states
4: ethnic group languages admitted in secondary schools for native-speakers of these languages
5: examples of ethnic group languages not officially admitted in secondary schools

As is indicated in columns 1-5 of table 4, the actual prestige of these languages in secondary education is rather different. The status of Frisian in Dutch education has not been taken into account (cf. Extra 1988); it is an optional language with specified goals and standard examination procedures, offered to both native and non-native speakers of Frisian in the province of Friesland. Chinese or Papiamento, which is the indigenous language at the Dutch Antilles, are not officially allowed as ethnic group languages in secondary education for reasons mentioned in section 4. However, Papiamento was introduced for the first time in a

secondary school in The Hague in 1988/1989 (cf. Samenwijs, October 1989, 68-69).

Given the growing cooperation between member-states of the European Community, teacher training programs for education in all national languages of the EC countries are presently being stimulated via the "Lingua" exchange program of the Erasmus Bureau in Brussels. In 1984, the Ministers of Education of the EC declared that the proficiency of member state students in foreign languages should be enhanced (note 3). Every member-state should promote student proficiency in at least two "foreign" languages, and at least one of these languages should be the national language of an EC member-state. In secondary school types in the Netherlands where students are obliged to take two "foreign" languages, these languages have always been English and German, or English and French. This traditional menu should be extended to other EC languages and to ethnic group languages, whether EC languages or not. Given the extending patterns of intercultural communication within Europe and abroad, a national policy plan on the type and number of non-indigenous languages to be offered at secondary schools should capitalize on the variety of languages already available in the Dutch community (cf. Van Els et al. 1990 for recent recommendations with a tendency in this direction). If well conceived, such a plan could have an exemplary function for other EC member-states.

The earlier mentioned testament of the late Deputy Minister of Education took a similar perspective. Ginjaar-Maas (1989) made a plea for extending the variety of EC languages and ethnic group languages in secondary education, and for extending the target groups of instruction in these languages to both majority and minority students. At the same time, the Ginjaar-Maas report stated that extensions could only gradually be introduced, given their financial implications. For this reason, the proposed extension of ethnic group languages in secondary schools should initially be limited to ethnic minority students of the second generation, i.e. students whose parents immigrated to the Netherlands. It is in particular the latter restriction that calls to mind an educational climate of temporary concessions.

6. *Ethnic minorities in adult education*

Even more than in secondary schools for adolescents, there is a huge diversity of institutions and target groups in the area of adult education. With respect to both first and second language instruction for non-native speakers of Dutch, at least the following questions arise:

1. what are the educational needs and ambitions of non-native speakers of Dutch?
2. what kind of educational programs are offered to this target group, in terms of goals, contents, and results?

3. what kind of mismatches can be observed between educational programs on the one hand, and educational needs and ambitions on the other?

As yet, little empirical evidence on each of these questions is available. In 1984, the Central Bureau of Statistics for the first time collected large-scale data on "language problems" of 1000 Turkish and 1000 Moroccan heads of families in the Netherlands (cf. CBS 1984). The concept of "language problems" related to different situations of language contact, i.e. understanding Dutch TV news, reading a Dutch paper, talking with a Dutch doctor, and writing a letter in Dutch, Turkish, or Arabic. The reactions of the chosen informants were matched with their age, duration of stay in the Netherlands, and previous schooling. Especially literacy in Dutch (i.e. proficiency in both reading and writing) was very limited for older adults with a low level of education and a long duration of stay. The CBS questionnaire, however, was not very sophisticated and reliable, given the high probability of attitudinal answer bias.

In the area of adult education, Verhallen (1986) made an inventory of existing L2 programs for non-native speakers of Dutch. The inventory showed evidence of a large variation in educational institutions, target groups, goals, and contents of L2 instruction. Most institutions used a variety of existing and self-made course material, without clear indications of systematic and stepwise L2 instruction. In this section we will focus on basic and secondary education for non-native speakers of Dutch respectively. Basic education is offered within a system of governmental facilities for both native and non-native speakers of Dutch, who have had less than two years of previous secondary schooling; instructional programs focus on elementary skills in Dutch, English, arithmetics, social behaviour, and job orientation. Secondary education for adults in the Netherlands is primarily meant as second chance schooling for all students who wish to enter higher types of education in a later stage of life.

First data on participants, teachers, and activities in basic education for adults were collected by Doets & Huisman (1988). Their study was based on written questionnaires, completed in 1988 by 220 institutions. Information was gathered on more than 52.000 participants in basic education, a figure that amounts to 80% of the total number of participants in the Netherlands. 42% of all informants belonged to EM-groups; most of them were unemployed Turks or Moroccans under thirty with a low level of previous schooling. Most teachers were native-Dutch and part-time volunteers; in fact, there were more volunteers than professionals in 40% of the institutions, very few full-time professionals, and even less teachers belonging to EM groups. The most frequently organized activities were courses of Dutch as a second language; most L2 programs were based on 2-5 hours of instruction per week. As yet, HLI for EM groups is a marginal phenomenon in basic adult education; facilities mainly relate to HLI in terms of an initial or temporary bridging towards L2 instruction. Only 47 out of 220 institutions organized courses on

Turkish or Arabic for only 4% of Turkish or Moroccan participants; even most literacy courses for illiterate adults focused on L2 instruction. Unfortunately, no information was gathered on L1/L2 needs, goals, contents, or effects of instruction; neither was any information gathered on the quality of instruction or the quality of preferred course material. From various perspectives, the data of Doets & Huisman (1988) are alarming. This holds especially for the low level of professionalization and for the low intensity of instruction. If EM groups should reach a L2 proficiency level that would be sufficient for further education or a qualified position on the labour market, more intensive L2 courses with specified goals, contents, and evaluation procedures would be needed in combination with more qualified and better paid teachers.

The lack of financial means for improving the quality of basic education can also be illustrated by the fact that 45% of the earlier mentioned 220 institutions had waiting-lists for interested candidates in L2 instruction. Recently, the Scientific Council for Governmental Policy published a report that included recommendations on the improvement of adult education for EM groups (cf. WRR 1989a). In the area of basic education, the Council made a plea for expanding the capacity of existing programs, for eliminating the waiting-lists mentioned before, for free-of-charge access to basic education, and for nationally recognized final certificates with civil effects. Under the condition of fulfillment of these requirements, the Council recommended to change the right of EM groups to basic education into an obligation to participate for those who are in need of this type of schooling. Meanwhile, the latter proposal has provoked so many negative reactions that it is not very likely that it will be translated into governmental action. It would certainly make more sense to focus on a comprehensive obligation of teacher training and educational professionalization rather than on a selective obligation for adult EM groups to take part in basic education.

EM students who have had some previous secondary schooling in the Netherlands or abroad, have no official access to the facilities of basic adult education. Although such students can take part in a variety of part-time or full-time secondary education programs for adults, the actual degree of participation of EM students in these programs is relatively low, whereas drop-out rates are high. The programs offered have high thresholds for admission, and they are not particularly oriented towards the needs and ambitions of EM students. In fact, the programs should offer far better possibilities of access to higher education for these students.

A Program Committee on Dutch as a second language in adult secondary education, installed at the instigation of the Inspection for Adult Education, published a report in 1986 with a number of recommendations for improving the quality of L2 instruction for this particular target group (cf. Reuten et al. 1986). Suggestions were made with respect to interim and final goals of L2 instruction, intensity of instruction (at least 10 hours per week), access to further education, and improvement of teacher training and course ware development. As yet,

the committee's recommendations have not been translated into affirmative governmental action.

During the seventies, the available course material for L2 instruction focused heavily on grammatical skills for highly schooled adult L2 learners (e.g., university students). More recently, the spectrum of course material has been broadened to different types of skills for different types of learners, e.g. course material for elementary listening comprehension, vocabulary acquisition for advanced learners, or acquisition of literacy by illiterate adults (cf. Jansen & Van Veen 1985 for a discussion and survey of L2 course material for adults). Nevertheless, there is a need of more sophisticated course material for advanced learners in differentiated types of further education; apart from specialized course material, this need includes reference grammars, dictionaries, and L2 proficiency tests for advanced learners. The most widely used L2 test programs at this moment have been initiated by the Central Institute of Test Development (cf. Janssen-Van Dieten et al. 1988) and the Dutch Language Union (cf. Beheydt 1987). The former test program is meant for target groups in lower professions, whereas the latter has originally been meant for target groups abroad. In practice, the Dutch Language Union's Certificate on Dutch as a *Foreign* Language is also asked for and distributed in the Netherlands, due to the absence of an officially recognized system of L2 tests and certificates in the Netherlands with a civil effect.

Similar shortcomings can be observed in teacher training programs or teacher qualifications. Although L2 instruction is widely considered as a highly specialized type of educational activity that differs from both first and foreign language teaching, there are no extensive specialized teacher training programs or teacher qualifications for this profession. Examples of how to change this state of the art can be found at various places abroad, e.g. in the USA (ESL programs) or in Sweden.

7. Conclusions and perspective

Over the last decade, a huge increase of the literature on both first and second language acquisition and teaching of EM groups in the Netherlands can be observed. Unfortunately, much of this literature is only documented in semi- or unpublished reports and written in Dutch. As a consequence, access for an interested audience abroad is very limited. It is only cold comfort that a similar phenomenon can be observed in other European countries dealing with similar issues (e.g., the extensive Swedish literature on bilingualism of EM groups). This trend of inward orientation should at least partly be reversed in order to promote crossnational and crosscultural communication and research.

Ethnolinguistic variation in the Netherlands is conceived by most majority groups (e.g., Dutch policy makers, school principals, or teachers) in terms of "problems" and "deficits" rather than resources and differences. This biased conception is evidenced in the government's policy definition of EM target groups. Socio-economic status is the decisive criterion for access to special facilities instead of ethnolinguistic

status. Even within this restrictive policy, facilities are only granted for a limited number of EM groups, depending upon source country background or duration of stay, and they are only granted during a limited period of time. The overt or covert argument for such temporary concessions is that "both first and second language problems will disappear over time". In a sense, this argument shows that if majority languages are conceived as problems for minority groups, then minority languages should be conceived as problems for majority groups. Also in the perception of scholars abroad, it is a paradoxical phenomenon that many of the Dutch elite who spent about half of their secondary schooling in learning English, French, German, Latin, Greek, and Dutch, generally take a rather negative attitude towards the learning of ethnic community languages by EM groups (note 4). A partial explanation of this paradox should be looked for abroad. Census data on home language use of Dutch immigrants in the US, Canada, and Australia show that the Dutch belong to the EM groups who give up their home language within one generation (cf. Veltman 1983, De Vries & Vallee 1980, Clyne 1982). Apparently, language is not conceived by many Dutch immigrants as a core-value of cultural identity (cf. Smolicz 1979). Mirror-like attitudes on home language shift seem to prevail in Dutch expectations of EM behavior in the Netherlands.

There is an urgent need for a policy on ethnolinguistic variation that would seriously explore and extend existing non-indigenous language resources in the Netherlands. Such a policy should also include a periodical, large-scale collection of census data on home language use. Especially in the latter domain of demolinguistics, advantage should be taken of multiple experiences abroad in solving the paradox between sophisticated information on home language use and large-scale collection of such data.

A typical characteristic of research and development activities on education in the Netherlands is the separation of research (at universities), curriculum development (at the National Institute of Curriculum Development, called SLO), and test development (at a similar institute, called CITO). Especially in the non-traditional field under consideration, more long-term cooperation between these different institutions, with an input of both linguistic and educational expertise, is needed if serious progress is to be made. Another typical restraint of developmental activities on education in the Netherlands is that course ware development is not conceived as a national task. The so-called principle of "free education" has provoked a strong governmental reluctance to stimulate, finance, and evaluate the development of first and second language course material for EM groups. As a result, this particular field of course ware development shows a lack of incentives, cooperation, and professionalism, and a lack of accumulation of knowledge.

Present-day efforts in the domains of elementary, secondary, and adult education for EM groups should be extended and coordinated, both with respect to first and second language learning and teaching. These efforts

should include the development of professional teacher training programs and teacher qualifications. In combination with these efforts, research should focus on descriptive and evaluative studies on language learning and teaching, taking into account teacher and learner behaviour, and teacher-learner interaction. From a methodological point of view, these studies should include in-depth longitudinal case-studies and cross-sectional studies on larger groups of informants. Process-oriented studies should focus on first language learning, second language learning, and the interaction between both. Output-oriented studies should focus on effects in terms of language proficiency and language attitudes, and they should include the development of diagnostic instruments for measuring type and degree of bilingualism.

Finally, the Ministry of Education installed a national task force in 1989 for promoting the quality of activities in second language instruction for EM groups in elementary and secondary education (cf. Uitleg 18b, July 12, 1989 for a task description). From the perspectives taken in this paper, it may be needless to conclude that the scope and composition of this task group should be extended to both first and second language learning in elementary, secondary, and adult education.

Notes

(1) On the private initiatives of concerned parents in the Chinese community, more than 20 Chinese schools have been founded in the Netherlands in which Chinese is taught at extra-curricular hours, in addition to the educational program of "regular" schools. The total number of children participating in these Chinese lessons was estimated at 4000 in 1988, covering an age-range of 4 - 12 years (Information derived from Stichting CCRM, Mathenesserlaan 481, Rotterdam).

(2) In the Inner London Boroughs, where a similar conception is adhered to, the Inspectorate for Bilingual Development and Community Languages (which is a subdivision of the Inner London Education Authority) is not prepared to authorize or examine any home language instruction at non-regular or extra-curricular hours (Personal communication of Min-Tsow, BDCL Inspector).

(3) Declaration of June 4, 1984. In fact, the declaration of EC Ministers had a low profile, because it was based on a list of "conclusions" instead of "recommendations". In the EC jargon, only the latter concept has a more compelling status.

(4) At the traditional grammar school, which still has a high prestige in the Netherlands, Latin and Greek were commonly taught during at least six hours per week each. The cultural prestige of these dead languages was high enough to preclude questions on "effects" of

instruction. For this reason, even a widespread later loss of laboriously acquired translational skills was and is taken for granted.

References

ACLO Moedertaal. 1982. *Onderwijs in een multiculturele en multi-etnische samenleving*. Enschede: ACLO-M.

ACOM (Adviescommissie onderzoek minderheden). 1989. *Onderzoek etnische minderheden. Een geselecteerde bibliografie van onderzoek tussen 1984 en 1989*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken.

Appel, R. 1984. *Immigrant children learning Dutch. Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of second-language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Appel, R. (ed.) 1986. *Minderheden: taal en onderwijs*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.

ARBO (Adviesraad basisonderwijs). 1988. *Een boog van woorden tot woorden. Advies over het onderwijs aan leerlingen uit etnische minderheden*. Zeist: ARBO.

Beheydt, L. 1987. *Het certificaat Nederlands en Nederlands als tweede taal*. Voorzet 7, Nederlandse Taalunie. Den Haag: Bibliographia Neerlandica.

Bergman, B. 1989. *Onderwijs eigen taal in het voortgezet onderwijs. Een onderzoek naar de belangstelling voor de eigen taal van Turkse en Marokkaanse leerlingen*. Tilburg: Werkverband Taal en Minderheden.

Bienfait, N. & B. Salverda (eds.) 1986. *Wegwijzer Taalonderwijs Nederlands aan meertalige leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Enschede: SLO.

Bienfait, N. & B. Salverda (eds.). 1987. *Wegwijzer Taalonderwijs Nederlands aan meertalige leerlingen in het basisonderwijs*. Enschede: SLO.

Boos-Nuenning, U., M. Hohmann, H. Reich & F. Wittek. 1983. *Aufnahmeunterricht, Muttersprachlicher Unterricht, Interkultureller Unterricht*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.

Buis, J. & M. Oud-de Glas. 1982. *Doelstellingen voor vreemde-taalonderwijs*. Nijmegen: ITS.

CBS (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek). 1984. *De leefsituatie van Turken en Marokkanen in Nederland. Eerste uitkomsten (Deel 1) en Kerncijfers (Deel 2)*. Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.

Churchill, S. 1986. *The education of linguistic and cultural minorities in the OECD countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Clyne, M. 1982. *Multilingual Australia. Resources, needs, policies*. Melbourne: River Seine Publ.

De Jong, M., A. Mol & P. Oirbans. 1988. *Zoveel talen, zoveel zinnen. De behoefte aan lessen eigen taal in het voortgezet onderwijs.* Rotterdam: Vakgroep Onderwijssociologie.

De Vries, J. & F. Vallee. 1980. *Language use in Canada.* Ottawa: Bureau of Statistics.

Doets, C. & T. Huisman. 1988. *De basiseducatie in cijfers.* Amersfoort: SVE.

Driessen, G., P. Jungbluth & J. Louvenberg. 1987. *Onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur. Doelopvattingen, leerkrachten, leermiddelen en omvang.* Den Haag: SVO.

Driessen, G., K. de Bot & P. Jungbluth. 1989. *De effectiviteit van het onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur. Prestaties van Marokkaanse, Spaanse en Turkse leerlingen.* Nijmegen: ITS/ITT.

Eldering, L. & J. Kloprogge (eds.). 1989. *Different cultures, same school. Ethnic minority children in Europe.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Ellemers, J., J. Vermeulen & M. Borghuis (eds.). 1988. *Etnische minderheden in Nederland. Een geselecteerde bibliografie van sociaal-wetenschappelijke publicaties 1945-1986.* Muiderberg: Coutinho.

Entzinger, H. 1987. Een kleine wereld. *Migrantenstudies* 4, 3, 2-10.

Extra, G. 1986. De positie van etnische groepstalen in het voortgezet onderwijs. *Levende Talen* 407, 32-37.

Extra, G. 1989. Ethnic minority languages versus Frisian in Dutch primary schools. A comparative perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10, 1, 59-72.

Extra, G., R. Van Hout & T. Vallen (eds.). 1987. *Etnische minderheden: taalverwerving, taalonderwijs, taalbeleid.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Extra, G. & T. Vallen (eds.). 1985. *Ethnic miorities and Dutch as a second language.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Extra, G. & T. Vallen. 1988. Language and ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 73, 85-110.

Extra, G. & T. Vallen. 1989. *Second language acquisition in elementary school. A crossnational perspective on the Netherlands, Flanders, and the Federal Republic of Germany.* In: L. Eldering & J. Kloprogge (eds.), 153-188.

Fase, W. 1987. *Voorbij de grenzen van onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur. Meertaligheid op school in zes landen verkend.* Den Haag: SVO.

Fase, W. & M. de Jong. 1983. *Beleidsgerichte evaluatie van het functioneren van de schakelperiode.* Rotterdam: Vakgroep Onderwijssociologie.

Ginjaar-Maas, N. 1989. *Concept-Beleidsnotitie Onderwijs in de eigen taal.* Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen.

Hacquebord, H. 1989. *Tekstbegrip van Turkse en Nederlandse leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs.* Dordrecht: ICG Printing.

Hofman-Okkes, I. 1987. *Schoolboeken leren lezen. Adviezen voor leraren.* Muiderberg: Coutinho.

Inspectiewerkgroep. 1983. *Culturele minderheden in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Zeist: Inspectie Voortgezet Onderwijs.

Inspectierapport 15. 1987. *Onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur in het voortgezet onderwijs. Stand van zaken in scholen met OETC 1986-1987*. Den Haag: Staatsdrukkerij.

Inspectierapport 27. 1988. *OETC niet apart maar samen. Een verkennend onderzoek naar de stand van zaken betreffende het onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur in het basisonderwijs*. Den Haag: Staatsdrukkerij.

Jansen, M & C. Van Veen. 1985. *Leermiddelen gezocht*. Utrecht: STEM/NCB.

Janssen-Van Dieten, A. et al. 1988. *Instaptoets Anderstalige Volwassenen*. Arnhem: Centraal Instituut voor Toetsontwikkeling.

Kerkhoff, A. 1988. *Taalvaardigheid en schoolsucces. De relatie tussen taalvaardigheid Nederlands en schoolsucces van allochtone en autochtone leerlingen aan het einde van de basisschool*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Kloprogge, J. (ed.). 1989. *Voorrang voor de gebieden? Notitie over het onderwijsvoorrangsbeleid in 1988*. Den Haag: SVO.

Koulen, I. & V. Smit. 1988. *Bibliografie etnische groepen. Een overzicht van in Nederland verschenen publikaties mbt etnische groepen in de periode 1985-1986*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitg. Mij.

Kroon, S. & T. Vallen (eds.). 1989. *Etnische minderheden en Nederlands als tweede taal in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. Voorzet 23, Nederlandse Taalunie. Den Haag: Bibliographia Neerlandica.

Lucassen, J. & R. Penninx. 1985. *Nieuwkomers. Immigranten en hun nakomelingen in Nederland 1550-1985*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.

Meestringa, T. 1989. *Verslag van de raadpleging rond het voorstel voor een leerplan voor OETC in het basisonderwijs*. Enschede: SLO.

Muus, P. 1989. *Migration, minorities and policy in the Netherlands. Recent trends and developments*. Amsterdam: Institute for Social Geography.

Nelde, P., G. Extra, M. Hartig & M. de Vriendt (eds.). 1981. *Sprachprobleme bei Gastarbeiterkindern*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Pais, A. 1981. *Beleidsplan culturele minderheden in het onderwijs*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen.

Projectgroep Legio. 1987. *Voorstel voor een leerplan voor het onderwijs in de eigen taal en cultuur in het basisonderwijs*. Enschede: SLO.

Reuten, J. et al. 1986. *Nederlands voor anderstalige volwassenen. Doelstellingen en exameneisen voor de certificaten A en B*. Zeist: Inspectie Onderwijs Volwassenen.

Roelandt, T & J. Veerman. 1988. *Minderheden in Nederland. Positie in het onderwijs*. Rotterdam: Instituut voor Sociaal-Economisch Onderzoek.

Roolvink, J. 1970. *Buitenlandse werknemers*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken.

Schoorl, J. 1988. *Niet-Nederlandse bevolking in Nederland: 1977-1987-1992*. Den Haag: Nederlands Interdisciplinair Demografisch Instituut.

Smolicz, J. 1979. *Culture and education in a plural society*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Center.

Steinert, I. et al. 1985. *Van school naar beroep. Delen 1-4: Administratie, Horeca, Verzorging, Techniek*. Den Bosch: KPC.

Tesser, P. et al. 1989. *De beginfase van het voorrangsbeleid in het basisonderwijs*. Nijmegen: ITS.

Tosi, A. 1984. *Immigration and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Van der Linden, T. et al. 1983. *Instaptoets Anderstaligen*. Arnhem: Centraal Instituut voor Toetsontwikkeling.

Van de Wetering, S. 1986. *Het onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur aan Marokkaanse kinderen in Nederland*. Utrecht: Vakgroep Oosterse Talen en Culturen.

Van Els, T. et al. 1990. *Horizon Taal. Nationaal Actie Programma moderne vreemde talen. Nota van aanbevelingen*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen.

Van Gurp, J. 1989. *Nederlands als tweede taal in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Enschede: VALO-Moedertaal.

Van Kemenade, J. 1974. *Beleidsplan voor het onderwijs aan groepen in achterstandssituaties*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen.

Veltman, C. 1983. *Language shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.

Verhallen, S. 1986. *Lessen Nederlands voor anderstalige volwassenen in Nederland. Een inventarisatie van cursussen naar doel en opbrengst*. Voorzet 9, Nederlandse Taalunie. Den Haag: Bibliographia Neerlandica.

Verhoeven, L., A. Vermeer & C. van de Guchte. 1986. *Taaltoets Allochtone Kinderen*. Tilburg: Zwijsen.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid. 1989a. *Allochtonenbeleid*. WRR-Rapport 36, Den Haag: SDU Uitgeverij.

Wetenschappelijke raad voor het regeringsbeleid. 1989b. *Advies over de voorlopige eindtermen basisvorming in het voortgezet onderwijs. Deel 8: Nederlands*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen.